

I am writing to comment on what I see as Sinclair Broadcasting's blatant violation of the public trust. Their decision to force their stations to air a decidedly partisan "documentary" just days before the election is an obviously politically motivated decision, with the intention of affecting the outcome of the election. This amounts to a free, 90 minute infomercial favoring one party over the other.

The government, as an extension of the public, grants Sinclair the priveledge of using the public airwaves free of charge. Legally, Sinclair should be obligated to serve the public interest. In this instance, they are obviously violating that obligation. This is a prime example of what happens when we allow large companies control large proportions of the airwaves. The public interest is dismissed and ignored, replaced instead by strictly financial interests concentrated in the hands of the few, rich, and powerful. Local control of the local media is stripped away and handed off to a few powerful interests, and as we know, power corrupts. This leads, inexorably, to the corruption of the airwaves to the detriment of the public interest.

Sinclair's decision in this case, as in the case several months ago of refusing to allow their local station to broadcast the reading of the names of the fallen soldiers in Iraq, are perfect examples of how powerful media interest is refusing to serve the public good. This is why media ownership rules should be strengthened, not weakened. We give them the Priveledge to serve us. They need to show us why we should continue to offer them this priveledge, by revoking the license of those who would violate their obligation to serve the greater public interest.

Thank you,